



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/937,185	09/21/2001	Shunsuke Ohtsuka	NSG-202US	6364

23122 7590 08/26/2003

RATNERPRESTIA
P O BOX 980
VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482-0980

EXAMINER

CRANE, SARA W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2811

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/937,185

Applicant(s)

OHTSUKA ET AL.

Examiner

Sara W. Crane

Art Unit

2811

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Sara W. Crane.

(3) _____.

(2) Ken Nigon.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 05 August 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: of record.

Identification of prior art discussed: 3-194978.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The rejection of claim 1-4 and 8 is based on the discussion of the prior art in Applicant's specification, which is based on Japanese Patent No. 2807910. Mr. Nigon states that the Japanese reference 3-194978 corresponds to this Japanese patent. Examiner cannot verify this (PAJ web site does not give this number), so examiner requested Mr. Nigon to state on the record that Japanese reference 3-194978 issued as Japan 2807910. Specifically, the rejection is based on figure 2 of the specification, which the specification states is a perspective view of the array of figure 1, and which shows "crossed wirings," as required by i.e. claim 1. This does not appear to be merely a "schematic" as argued by Applicant, but appears to the examiner to show specific device structure. This figure is labeled "prior art" in the drawings submitted with the previous Office action. Applicant will consider modifying the drawing labels. Applicant also discussed the claim term "blocks." Applicant apparently considers this term to refer, not to circuit blocks of commonly connected elements, but to actual physical groupings of devices contiguous or immediately adjacent to one another. Examiner will attempt to find such a definition in the specification or in electronic dictionaries, but if Applicant wishes to rely on such a definition for patentability, it really should be stated by the Applicant somewhere in the record. .

→ These two have a common inventor. 3-194978 did not issue as JA 2807910, however. Same family, not same patent. SWC